



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,719	11/10/2003	Steve Cote	14485.156US01	4984
7590	10/19/2006		EXAMINER	
Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/705,719	COTE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Christopher D. Koharski	3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date see attached (x7).
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Claims 1-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group (Group I elected), there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 9/21/2006.

Currently claims 1-9 and 21-24 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 21 being independent.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statements (IDS) that were submitted on 3/3/2003, 7/19/2004, 10/29/2004, 2/7/2005, 2/22/2005, 8/23/2005, and 9/1/2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statements.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Regarding claim 2, there is a lack of antecedent basis for the "step of loading" there is no prior loading step disclosed in the previous referenced independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hunn et al. (2004/0158207). Hunn et al. discloses an infusion set device for cannula insertion.

Regarding claims 1 and 4-7, Hunn et al. discloses a method for introducing an infusion device comprising an infusion device (1) onto a needle (8) of an insertion device so the needle extends through the cannula (3) of the infusion device whereby the system is placed adjacent the skin of a patient ([0073-0076]) wherein the cannula is introduced into the skin of the patient with the needle being automatically triggered and withdrawn (Figures 9-13) ([0077-0078]). Additionally, an infusion device (2) includes a cannula (3) and method of coupling the system (Figures 1, 2 and 5) wherein positioning

the assembly includes placing the set into a locked and unlocked state for fluid transfer ([0067-0068]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunn et al. in view of Mogensen et al. (2003/0109829). Hunn et al. meets the claim limitations as described above except for the inclusion of a cap/sleeve element and Applicants claimed associated steps.

However, Mogensen et al. teaches an injector device for placing a subcutaneous infusion set.

Regarding claims 2-3 and 9, Mogensen et al. teaches the step of loading by coupling a cap to the insertion device and removing the cap prior to insertion into the of the system into the body (Figures 1-5) ([0028-0035]).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include the cap of Mogensen et al. to the system of Hunn et al. because the addition of cap element keep the system sterile and allows for needle stick protection. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Mogensen et al.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunn et al. in view of Larsen et al. (6,736,797). Hunn et al. meets the claim limitations as described above except for the step of using a rotational locking mechanism of the infusion set.

However, Larsen et al. teaches a subcutaneous infusion set.

Regarding claim 8, Larsen et al. teaches reorienting the set rotationally relative to the site and moving the system from a locked to unlocked position (Figures 1 and 5, col 5 In 1-53, col 8 34-49).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include the infusion set of Larsen et al. to the system of Hunn et al. because the addition of a rotational system allows for easy coupling and access to the infusion site and set. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Larsen et al.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mogensen et al. in view of Hunn et al.

Regarding claims 21-24, Mogensen et al. discloses a method for introducing an infusion set comprising uncapping the insertion device to place the insertion device in a delivery state wherein the device is placed adjacent to the skin, with a tamper evident seal placed (42) on the insertion device (Figures 1-5, [0028-0035]).

Mogensen et al. meets the claim limitations as described above except for automatically retracting and having a locked and unlocked infusion state.

Hunn et al. discloses an infusion set device for cannula insertion.

Regarding claims 21-24, Hunn et al. teaches a method for introducing an infusion device comprising an infusion device (1) onto a needle (8) of an insertion device so the needle extends through the cannula (3) of the infusion device whereby the system is placed adjacent the skin of a patient ([0073-0076]) wherein the cannula is introduced into the skin of the patient with the needle being automatically triggered and withdrawn (Figures 9-13) ([0077-0078]). Additionally, an infusion device (2) includes a cannula (3) and method of coupling the system (Figures 1, 2 and 5) wherein positioning the assembly includes placing the set into a locked and unlocked state for fluid transfer ([0067-0068]).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include the automatic needle retraction and locking infusion set of Hunn et al. to the system of Mogensen et al. because the addition of an automatic needle retraction system and locking setup

allows for ease of use and an increase in patient comfort. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Hunn et al.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 10/11/06

*Wen*  
MOULTRIDGE, INC.  
SCT

*ck*  
Christopher D. Koharski  
AU 3763